



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,186	01/14/2000	Francisco Corella	10001559-1	8070

22879 7590 11/28/2003

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2134

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/483,186	CORELLA, FRANCISCO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Christopher J Brown	2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2002.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01/14/00 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4-8. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Corrected patent application numbers are required on page 1 lines 6-17.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term “unsigned certificate” is used in claims 1 and 13, where in the applicant defines a public key certificate on page 2 line 9 as a certificate signed by a certificate authority. It is unclear what “unsigned” means in this case, as the applicant does not fully explain this term in the application. The examiner interprets “unsigned” to mean that the certificate is only signed by the certificate authority, for the application. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 18, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Andrews US 6,324,645.

As per claims 1 and 13, Andrews discloses that a certificate authority issues a certificate to a user that binds the public key of the user to the users long term identification information, (Col 3 lines 26-30, 55-58). Andrews discloses that a hash of the certificate (jurisdiction hash) sent to a verifier is compared to a recorded hash on a database for authentication, (Col 9 lines 59-67 Col 10 lines 1-7). Andrews discloses that the subject

demonstrates said subject has knowledge of a private key corresponding to the public key in the certificate, (Col 10 lines 34-37).

As per claims 2 and 14, Andrews discloses that the certificate has a date and time, (Validity) (Col 9 line 26, 34-36).

As per claims 6 and 18, Andrews discloses that the hash computed is a collision free hash, (Col 5 lines 30-34).

As per claims 7 and 19, Andrews discloses that the hash is a SHA hash (Col 5 line 34).

As per claims 8 and 20, Andrews discloses that the hash is an MD5 hash (Col 5 line 34).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claims 3, 4 and 15, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews US 6,324,645 in view of Maruyama US 6,393,563

As per claims 3 and 15, Andrews discloses that the certificate may not have a time and date, (Col 6 line 28).

As per claims 4 and 16, Andrews discloses a private key. Andrews does not disclose storing the private key on a smart card.

Maruyama disclose a private key may be stored on a smartcard, (Col 1 line 20, 53-56).

It would be obvious to modify the Andrews private key with Maruyama's smart card, because the smart card increases the security of key storage.

5. Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews US 6,324,645 in view of Kausik US 6,263,446.

As per claims 5 and 17, Andrews does not disclose a software wallet.

Kausik discloses storing a private key in a software wallet, (Col 4 lines1-6).

It would be obvious to modify Andrews private key with Kausik's software wallet because the wallet increases the security of key storage.

6. Claims 9 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews US 6,324,645 in view of Gasser US 5,224,163.

As per claims 9 and 21, Andrews does not disclose that the certificate is revoked based on the validity of the long term information and public key.

Gasser discloses that if the key of the certificate is compromised, it is revoked, (Col 7 lines 5-9).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Andrews certificate revocation with Gassers invalid key revocation, because a subject that used an invalid key would not be accepted.

7. Claims 10, 11 and 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews US 6,324,645 in view of Micali US 5,793,868 in view of Boyle 6,212,636.

As per claims 10 and 22, Andrews does not disclose a revocation system involving hashes. Micali discloses a certificate revocation system where the certificate authority takes a hash of the certificates to be revoked, (Col 3 lines 18-23).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Andrews revocation system with Micali's hashes, because hash's take less memory to store, and are well known for authentication properties in the art.

Boyle discloses that upon being notified that a certificate is revoked, that any data related to the certificate is erased from memory, (Col 21 line 59- 67).

It would be obvious to modify the Andrews Micali combination above with Boyle's method of deletion, because a subject would not want to accidentally use a revoked certificate.

As per claims 11 and 23, Andrews discloses that the certificate authority may mark the certificate as being invalid (CRL), (Col 6 lines 31-35).

8. Claims 12, and 24, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andrews US 6,324,645 in view of Micali US 5,793,868 in view of Boyle 6,212,636 in view of Gasser US 5,224,163.

As per claims 12 and 24, Andrews's combination does not disclose deleting the certificate from the database once it has been revoked.

Gasser discloses a certificate authority (GNS) deletes the revoked certificate, (Col 7 lines 5-10).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the Andrew's combination with Gasser's deletion method because the certificates are no longer useful.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J Brown whose telephone number is 703-305-8023. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on 703-308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Christopher J. Brown

CJB

G. C. Morse
GREGORY MORSE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100